DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 413 468 CE 075 072

AUTHOR	Spalter-Roth, Roberta; Hartmann, Heidi; Burr, Beverly
TITLE	Income Insecurity: The Failure of Unemployment Insurance To Reach Working AFDC Mothers.
INSTITUTION	Institute for Women's Policy Research, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1994-03-00
NOTE	14p.; Paper presented at the Annual Employment Task Force Conference (2nd, Washington, D.C., March 20-22, 1994).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Eligibility; *Employed Women; Employment Patterns; *Mothers; National Surveys; *Public Policy; Sex Differences; Unemployment; *Unemployment Insurance; *Welfare Recipients
IDENTIFIERS	*Aid to Families with Dependent Children; Welfare to Work Programs

ABSTRACT

Because female heads of families tend to have less continuity of employment than their male counterparts do, they are twice as likely to face unemployment without unemployment insurance (UI) benefits. If Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), which is the primary income support program for impoverished single mothers and their children becomes a time-limited program promoting employment in the low-wage labor market, the UI program will be expected to serve as a substitute for AFDC. According to research conducted by the Institute for Women's Policy Research on a data set of 1,200 single AFDC mothers who represent 2.8 million single mothers receiving AFDC nationwide, the UI program cannot become an effective income supplement for most AFDC mothers unless UI eligibility requirements are revised significantly. The following changes in policy regarding UI were recommended: (1) expanding UI eligibility by reducing minimum earnings and work requirements so that UI provides more security for more low-wage, intermittent workers; (2) instituting a national policy of paid family leave to provide the income support necessary for periods of nonemployment resulting from childbirth or fulfillment of family responsibilities; and (3) extending temporary disability insurance to cover serious family emergencies. (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

INSTITUTE FOR WOMEN'S POLICY RESEARCH
1400 20th Street, NW, Suite 104
Washington, DC 20036

ED 413 468

Income Insecurity: The Failure of Unemployment Insurance to Reach Working AFDC Mothers

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

by
Roberta Spalter-Roth,
Heidi Hartmann, and
Beverly Burr

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Presented at
The Second Annual Employment Task Force Conference

March 20 - March 22, 1994

Telephone: (202) 785-5100 Fax: (202) 833-4362

CE075072

INCOME INSECURITY: THE FAILURE OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE TO REACH OUT TO WORKING AFDC MOTHERS

Unemployment Insurance (UI) was designed as a program to benefit full-time, full-year workers, usually with male bodies, facing periods of temporary layoff. In many states receipt of benefits requires relatively high prior earnings and involuntary reasons for job loss (with interruptions due to child birth or family responsibilities usually disqualified as "voluntary quits"). Because female heads of families tend to have less continuity of employment than do male heads of families, they are twice as likely to face unemployment without UI benefits.[1]

If Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), the primary income support program for impoverished single mothers and their children, becomes a time-limited program that promotes employment in the low-wage labor market, can UI serve as an effective substitute for AFDC, providing income security during periods of unemployment and non-employment? The answer, IWPR research shows, is that UI, as currently structured, is ***not*** an effective substitute for AFDC.

IWPR RESEARCH

For the past several years we have been engaged in extensive research on the AFDC population using 1984-1990 data from the Survey of Income and Program Participation, a Census Bureau data set. By combining panels of data we have generated a data set of 1,200 single AFDC mothers who represent 2.8 million single mothers receiving AFDC nationwide. These data shed light on the work behavior and the income sources for this group of women.

---

[1]Falk, Gene. "The Uncompensated Unemployed: An Analysis of Unemployed Workers Who Do Not Receive Unemployment Compensation", *CRS Report for Congress*, Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, November 15, 1990.

These data are particularly useful for examining the effectiveness of policies designed to supplement paid employment or in the words of the Administration to "make work pay." Here, we concentrate on Unemployment Insurance (UI) as an income supplement. We find that the great majority of working AFDC mothers do not receive unemployment benefits, despite substantial work effort. These women either do not qualify for benefits or have exhausted their benefits in the recent past. For those who do qualify, AFDC appears to function as an alternative or a supplement to UI benefits, indicating that UI alone does not provide the needed coverage during periods of unemployment and non-employment. In contrast to those recipients who receive UI, those who ***do not*** receive UI have fewer jobs, have fewer weeks of full-time work, are employed at service sector jobs, live in states where UI covers fewer workers, and are more likely to have newborn children or toddlers.

- Our research on single mothers who received AFDC for at least two months out of 24 shows that 43 percent also worked over the 24-month study period. These "work/welfare packagers," as we label them, worked an average of 910 hours per year, just about half-time, the same as most mothers in the labor force.

- Only 11 percent of the work/welfare packagers received ***any*** UI benefits despite their substantial work effort. Those who did receive UI benefits worked an average of 1050 hours per year (or 2093 over 2 years), slightly more than those who did not. (See Table 1.)

- Comparing those who received UI to those who did not, we see (Table 1) that the two groups appear to have about the same amount of human capital (although the non-UI group does have somewhat more education, but less work experience and job training). But the non-UI group appears to have lower wages, fewer jobs, fewer hours of work overall, and fewer weeks of full-time work. They also worked ***less*** in sales and administrative jobs and ***more*** in service jobs.

- Because the average hours of the non-UI recipients appear quite high, we thought it would be useful to look at those welfare mothers who did work a lot but who nevertheless did not receive UI. In Table 2, we see that of those who did not get UI

benefits, 78 percent worked in at least 25 weeks over the 2-year study period; they averaged 2200 hours of work in 69 weeks. The remaining 22 percent worked only about 15 weeks and 500 hours on average.

- Thus, the "heavy-working" non UI recipients exhibited just as much work effort as those AFDC mothers who did receive UI. In fact, they worked more hours in more weeks, but they worked fewer hours per week during the weeks they worked. They have the same years on the job, 1.9 years. (In Table 3, for the primary job only, rather than for all jobs shown in Tables 1 and 2, we see that they have more self employment and more weeks of part-time work than the UI recipients.)

- The only significant difference in work behavior between those who do and do not receive UI is the number of jobs these mothers held during the study period; UI recipients held more jobs, 2.3 versus 1.6, and had more employment transitions, 3.2 versus 2.1. Table 4 shows that, of those who received substantial UI benefits (more than $300 per month when receiving UI), about 30 percent held 3 jobs during the study period and 15 percent held 4 jobs--thus nearly half held 3 or more jobs. Given that job tenure is the same for both groups, the UI receiving group most likely held their multiple jobs simultaneously, accounting for their higher hours per week when working.

- We also see (Table 2) that the group of heavy-working non-UI recipients looks very similar to the group that did receive UI, in terms of their human capital (as well as their work effort). They have a substantial amount of work experience (6.3 voice 7.8 years for the UI recipients taken as a whole); the average highest grade completed is 11.5 compared to 11.1 for UI recipients, but they are somewhat less likely to have had job training.

- As noted, those who received UI benefits worked more intensively when they worked (worked more hours per week). They also had higher average hourly earnings: $4.86 voice $4.29 for the two groups overall (Table 1); $5.52 voice $4.48 (Table 2) when we compare those who received substantial UI benefits to those who did not receive UI benefits but had substantial work hours.

- Referring to the primary job alone, Table 3 again shows that those who ***did not*** receive UI were more likely to work in service occupations, particularly in food service, cleaning, and personal service. Virtually none of those who received substantial UI benefits ($300 or more per month receiving) worked in these service occupations. Those who received substantial benefits were most likely to work in sales and related occupations, in clerical and administrative support jobs, and as operators, handlers, and laborers, most likely in factories. Looking at the industrial distribution of recipients and non-recipients, rather than the occupational distribution, we see that only the manufacturing industry and the public sector are associated with substantially more UI receipt, while the service industry is associated with

substantially less. Table 3 also shows, however, that those UI recipients with low UI benefits (less than $300 per month when receiving) do work in the service sector; they are also especially likely to work in agriculture.

- Also, as Table 4 shows, those who receive UI benefits are more likely to live in states where the UI system covered more of the unemployed. Fewer than 2 percent of all UI recipients (those receiving both more and less than $300 per month) live in states where fewer than 25 percent of the unemployed are covered, compared to 13 percent of the non recipients who live in such states. States with more UI coverage of the unemployed may have more liberal eligibility standards; they may also have more occupations or industries that are associated with greater coverage, such as manufacturing.

- As Table 4 shows, those who receive UI benefits have fewer months on AFDC over the two-year study period than those who do not (10.5 voice. 14.4). They combine UI and AFDC receipt for only 1.6 months, although they receive UI benefits for about 4.2 months. Interestingly, even though UI recipients receive nearly $1,000 per year in benefits they receive only $100 less per year in AFDC than those who have no UI; for the months they receive AFDC, those with high UI benefits receive higher AFDC benefits than the non UI recipients.

- Those who receive substantial UI benefits are more likely to be "cyclers" -- those who move between work, AFDC receipt, UI benefits, and other sources of income; while those who receive modest UI benefits and those who receive none are more likely to be "combiners" -- they combine more modest earnings with longer term welfare receipt, often having income from both AFDC and earnings in the same month. These latter two groups, the low UI and no UI, apparently combine a longer-term, less intensive work effort (more months and weeks of work but fewer hours per week at lower hourly wages). The UI program apparently does not address the income needs of these "slow earners" -- despite their heavy work effort -- as well as it addresses the needs of those who work more intensively at somewhat higher wages. And not surprisingly, those who receive no or minimal UI benefits rely more on welfare.

- While there are few observable human capital differences between those who do and do not receive UI benefits, there are some demographic differences. Non-UI recipients are somewhat more likely to have had a birth during the two-year study period or to have a child under two, than those who received UI (see Table 5). It is possible that those who worked substantial hours but did not receive UI may have had family-related reasons for leaving work, and thus may not have been eligible for UI. The non UI recipients report fewer weeks looking for work, partly because they actually work more weeks, but perhaps also because they may have left work for family reasons which made them unavailable for work. Table 5 also shows that those who do not receive UI benefits are substantially more likely to be African American.

- Finally, please take a look at Figure 1. It displays the income packaging patterns of all the AFDC recipients in our sample who also received UI benefits. The amount of effort that these women apparently put out to keep up with the transitions in their lives is astounding. Think of the visits to administrative offices, the child care arrangements, and the job seeking effort, not to mention the actual work hours--at multiple jobs--that these low income women expend in an attempt to support themselves and their families, in the face of both unstable jobs and high family demands as single parents. By examining these patterns, we found that nearly one-half of these women began an AFDC spell rather than a new job when their UI benefits ended.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Low earnings, intermittent work (especially in service occupations), tight state eligibility requirements, and family responsibilities are major reasons for lack of UI receipt by working AFDC mothers. The original conception of UI does not meet the needs of women employed in the unstable low-wage labor market. In addition, many states disqualify workers, primarily women, who leave work for a variety of work/family-related reasons, such as shift changes which make child care impossible or difficult or leaving work to care for newborn or other family members.

What policy changes do these findings suggest? They suggest that UI will need to be more responsive to the substantial group of women who exhibit high work effort but who have low and sporadic earnings. If AFDC benefits are time-limited then UI eligibility will need to be expanded by reducing minimum earnings and work requirements so that it will provide security for more low-wage, intermittent workers. But reducing earnings or work requirements alone will not provide for the periods of unemployment resulting from childbirth or fulfillment of family responsibilities. A national policy of paid family leave could provide the necessary income support for these periods of non-employment. One

possible program to provide paid family care leave would be to extend Temporary Disability Insurance (TDI) as it currently exists in five states to all other states and to expand it to cover serious family emergencies.

Expanding UI and TDI will be arduous political struggles. In the interim, we should support initiatives that require states to continue to provide AFDC benefits to low-wage, intermittent workers by increasing existing earnings disregards, by not counting any months with employment and AFDC towards the proposed time limit, and by providing a federal minimum standard for AFDC benefit levels. These initiatives will increase recipients' income and provide for some income security during periods of unemployment.

Figure 1

Two-Year Patterns of AFDC, Work and Unemployment Benefit Spells: All Packagers with any Unemployment Benefits

Work →	UI →	AFDC					
Work →	UI →	AFDC					
Work →	UI →	AFDC					
Work →	UI/AFDC →	AFDC					
Work →	UI →	AFDC →	Work				
Work →	UI/AFDC →	AFDC →	AFDC/Work				
Work →	UI →	AFDC/Work →	Work				
Work →	UI →	UI/AFDC →	AFDC →	Work			
Work →	UI/AFDC →	AFDC →	AFDC/Work				
Work →	Work/UI →	AFDC/Work →	Work				
Work →	Work/UI →	Work →	AFDC/Work →	AFDC			
Work →	UI →	Work →	AFDC				
Work →	UI →	Work →	AFDC				
Work →	UI →	Work →	AFDC/Work →	Work			
Work →	UI →	Work →	AFDC/UI →	AFDC →	Work →	AFDC	
Work →	UI →	Work →	AFDC/Work →	Work →	AFDC →	AFDC/Work →	Work
Work →	AFDC →	Work →	UI				
Work →	AFDC →	Work →	UI				
Work →	AFDC →	Work/UI					
Work →	AFDC →	Work →	UI →	Work			
Work →	AFDC →	AFDC/Work →	AFDC/UI →	AFDC			
Work →	AFDC →	Work →	AFDC/UI →	UI →	AFDC/Work →	AFDC	
Work →	AFDC →	UI →	AFDC				
Work →	AFDC →	UI →	AFDC →	Work			
Work →	AFDC →	UI →	AFDC →	AFDC/Work			
Work →	AFDC →	UI →	Work				
Work →	AFDC →	AFDC/UI →	Work				
Work →	AFDC →	AFDC/UI →	AFDC →	AFDC/Work →	Work		
Work →	AFDC/Work →	Work →	UI →	Work/UI			
Work →	AFDC/Work →	AFDC/UI →	Work				
AFDC/Work →	Work →	UI					
AFDC/Work →	Work →	UI					
AFDC/Work →	UI →	AFDC →	AFDC/Work				
AFDC/Work →	AFDC/UI →	AFDC →	AFDC/Work				
AFDC/Work →	AFDC/UI →	AFDC/Work →	AFDC →	Work			
AFDC/Work →	AFDC →	AFDC/Work →	Work →	Work/UI			
AFDC/Work →	AFDC →	AFDC/Work →	Work →	UI			
AFDC/Work →	Work →	AFDC →	Work →	UI			
UI →	AFDC →	Work					
UI →	AFDC →	Work					
UI →	AFDC →	Work					
UI →	AFDC →	Work →	UI				
UI →	AFDC →	Work →	AFDC →	Work			
UI →	AFDC/Work →	UI					
UI/AFDC →	Work/UI →	Work					
UI →	Work →	AFDC					
UI →	Work →	AFDC →	Work →	AFDC			
UI →	Work →	AFDC/Work					
AFDC →	Work →	UI					
AFDC →	Work →	UI					
AFDC →	Work →	UI					
AFDC →	Work →	UI →	Work				
AFDC →	AFDC/Work →	Work →	AFDC/UI				
AFDC →	AFDC/Work →	AFDC/UI →	AFDC				
AFDC →	AFDC/Work →	UI →	Work				
AFDC →	AFDC/Work/UI →	AFDC/Work →	AFDC				
AFDC →	AFDC/UI →	AFDC/Work →	Work →	AFDC			
AFDC →	AFDC/Work →	AFDC/UI →	Work				
AFDC →	AFDC/Work →	AFDC/UI →	AFDC →	AFDC/Work →	AFDC		
AFDC →	AFDC/Work →	AFDC/UI →	AFDC				
AFDC →	AFDC/Work →	UI →	AFDC/Work				

Source: IWPR calculations based on the 1984, 1986, 1987, and 1988 Survey of Income and Program Participation.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 1
WORK/WELFARE PACKAGERS

Worker and Job Characteristics of Individuals Who
Received Unemployment Insurance Versus Individuals Who Did Not
(2 Year Period)

Characteristic	All Work/Welfare Packagers	Not Unemployment Insurance Recipients	Unemployment Insurance Recipients
Packager Population	1,198,955	1,069,508	129,447
(As % of Work/Welfare Packagers)	100.0%	89.2%	10.8%
HUMAN CAPITAL			
Work Experience (in years)	5.7	5.4	7.8
Highest Grade Completed	11.3	11.3	11.1
Job Training (ever or current)	33.7%	32.9%	39.9%
Federal Job Training (ever or current)	14.4%	14.2%	15.8%
EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS - ALL JOBS			
Jobs During Survey	1.7	1.6	2.3
Employment Spells During Survey	1.7	1.6	2.2
Total Hours Worked	1821.3	1788.5	2092.6
Weeks With Employment	54.0	53.6	57.3
Weeks on Layoff of Looking for Work	15.9	14.2	29.8
PRIMARY JOB EARNINGS			
Total Earnings (in 1990 dollars)	$7,366	$7,296	$7,945
Average Hourly Earnings (in 1990 dollars)	$4.29	$4.22	$4.83
Full-Time Weeks Worked	29.2	28.9	32.0
Part-Time Weeks Worked	17.3	18.0	11.8
OCCUPATION - PRIMARY JOB			
Managerial, Professional, & Technical	6.7%	6.4%	8.7%
Sales and Related	12.5%	12.0%	17.0%
Administrative Support and Clerical	15.9%	14.8%	24.6%
Service	39.7%	41.7%	22.8%
Farming, Forestry, and Fishing	1.3%	0.6%	7.3%
Precision Production, Craft and Repair	3.8%	4.2%	0.0%
Operators, Handlers, and Laborers	20.2%	20.3%	19.5%
UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS (in 1990 dollars)	$206	$0	$1,907

Source: IWPR calculations based on the 1984, 1986, 1987, and 1988 Survey of Income and Program Participation.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 2
WORK/WELFARE PACKAGERS

Worker and Job Characteristics
By Unemployment Recipiency Group

Characteristic	WORK/ WELFARE PACKAGERS	Unemployment Insurance Non-Recipients Weeks Worked		Unemployment Insurance Recipients Monthly Average Benefit	
		<25	25 or more	<$300	$300+
POPULATION	1,198,955	266,461	803,047	50,436	79,011
As % of Work/Welfare Packagers	100.0%	22.2%	67.0%	4.2%	6.6%
Sample	502	99	342	27	34
WORK BEHAVIOR					
Jobs during survey	1.6	1.3	1.6	2.3	2.2
Employment Spells During Survey	1.7	1.4	1.7	2.2	2.1
Employment spell starts	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.7	1.5
Employment Spell Stops	1.1	1.2	0.9	1.5	1.7
Employment spell transitions	2.3	2.3	2.1	3.3	3.2
Total hours worked	1,821.3	545.3	2,201.0	2,203.4	2,022
Average weekly hours in weeks worked	33.8	33.9	33.5	35.5	36.0
Average monthly hours in months worked	137.3	127.9	139.4	145.1	143.6
Months worked	13.0	4.4	15.7	15.1	13.6
Weeks with employment	56.0	16.4	68.9	61.8	54.3
Weeks on layoff or looking for work	15.9	21.3	11.8	26.0	32.2
HUMAN CAPITAL					
Work Experience **	5.7	2.8	6.3	7.5	7.9
Job Tenure **	1.6	0.8	1.9	0.8	1.9
No job tenure **	44.3%	62.3%	40.1%	35.2%	32.5%
Highest grade completed	11.3	10.7	11.5	10.3	11.7
Job Training (ever or current)	33.7%	29.1%	34.2%	26.9%	48.2%
Federal Job Training (ever or current)	14.4%	19.2%	12.6%	12.5%	17.9%
Hourly earnings	$4.29	$3.41	$4.48	$3.82	$5.52

** Indicates second wave (8th month) of survey

Source: IWPR calculations based on the 1984, 1986, 1987 and 1988 Survey of Income and Program Participation.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 3
WORK/WELFARE PACKAGERS

Characteristics of Primary Job *
By Unemployment Recipiency Group

Characteristic	All Work/ Welfare Packagers	Unemployment Insurance Non-Recipients Weeks Worked		Unemployment Insurance Recipients Monthly Average Benefit	
		< 25	25 or more	< $300	$300 +
POPULATION	1,198,955	266,461	803,047	50,436	79,011
As % of Work/Welfare Packagers	100.0%	22.2%	67.0%	4.2%	6.6%
Sample	502	99	342	27	34
JOB TYPE					
Percent Wage and Salary Job	96.3%	95.4%	96.0%	100%	100%
Percent Self-Employment Job	3.7%	4.6%	4.0%	0%	0%
Secondary Jobs	ERR	ERR	ERR	ERR	ERR
Hours Worked	1,570.4	509.5	1922.2	1,613.3	1545.4
Weeks Worked	46.5	14.9	57.5	45.5	42.6
Full-Time Weeks Worked	29.2	8.9	35.5	30.5	32.9
Part-Time Weeks Worked	17.3	6.0	22.0	15.1	9.7
Predominantly Part-Time Jobs	0.3	32.7%	27.9%	24.3%	9.2%
Average workweek length	34.7	35.5	34.2	35.9	36.4
JOB EARNINGS					
Total earnings	$7,366	$1,802	$9,119	$6,705	$8,736
Average hourly earnings	$4.29	$3.40	$4.49	$3.86	$5.45
OCCUPATION					
Managerial and Executive	2.7%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	5.8%
Professional	3.1%	0.8%	3.5%	5.5%	5.0%
Technician	0.9%	1.9%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Sales and Related	12.5%	15.7%	10.7%	9.0%	22.1%
Cashier	7.6%	10.1%	6.5%	9.0%	9.4%
Administrative Support and Clerical	15.9%	13.9%	15.1%	13.5%	31.7%
Service	39.7%	34.5%	44.1%	39.9%	11.9%
Food Service	11.5%	7.3%	14.3%	8.3%	0.0%
Cleaning Service	8.5%	8.6%	8.4%	18.2%	3.0%
Personal Service	9.7%	12.0%	10.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Other Service	9.9%	6.5%	10.9%	13.4%	8.9%
Farming, Forestry and Fishing	1.3%	2.3%	0.0%	13.3%	3.5%
Precision Production, Craft and Repair	3.8%	3.9%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Operators, Handlers and Laborers	20.2%	27.0%	18.0%	18.8%	20.0%
INDUSTRY					
Agriculture	4.1%	5.6%	2.8%	18.5%	3.5%
Mining	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Construction	0.5%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	2.7%
Manufacturing					
Nondurables	9.3%	10.9%	7.9%	14.0%	15.1%
Durables	8.1%	9.3%	7.5%	4.7%	12.0%
Transportation, Communication and Utiliti	1.1%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	2.5%
Wholesale Trade	2.7%	4.7%	2.1%	0.0%	4.0%
Retail Trade	24.0%	25.1%	24.8%	17.3%	16.1%
Finance, Insurance and Real Estate	3.3%	1.2%	4.0%	0.0%	5.9%
Service	43.5%	37.8%	47.0%	45.4%	26.0%
Public Administration	3.4%	5.4%	2.1%	0.0%	12.2%

* Primary job is the job at which the AFDC mother worked the most hours.

Source: IWPR calculations based on the 1984, 1986, 1987 and 1988 Survey of Income and Program Participation.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 4

Differences Between UI Recipients and Non-Recipients

Characteristic	Unemployment Insurance Non-Recipients Weeks Worked		Unemployment Insurance Recipients Average Monthly UI Benefits	
	<25	25 or more	<$300	$300+
POPULATION	266,460	803,047	50,436	79,011
As percent of work/welfare packagers	22.2%	67.0%	4.2%	6.6%
AFDC AND UNEMPLOYMENT				
Months on AFDC	18.6	13.0	11.9	9.6
Avg Monthly AFDC Benefit	$354	$300	$306	$383
Total AFDC amount	$6,756	$4,122	$4,009	$3,875
Months on UI			3.3	4.8
Avg Monthly UI Benefit			$155	$586
Total UI Benefits			$582	$2,720
Months with AFDC & UI	0.0	0.0	1.5	1.6
Percent of UI months with AFDC	0.0%	0.0%	47.0%	36.8%
Percent of AFDC months with UI	0.0%	0.0%	13.2%	14.5%
AFDC AND WORK PATTERNS				
Months with work	4.4	15.7	15.1	13.6
Months combining AFDC and work	2.1	5.8	4.9	3.2
Months with no AFDC and with work	1.9	9.3	9.6	9.6
Months with neither AFDC nor work	3.5	1.7	2.5	4.8
Months with AFDC and no work	16.5	7.2	7.0	6.4
Combiners	29.7%	52.6%	62.2%	36.9%
Cyclers	70.3%	47.4%	37.8%	63.1%
STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COVERAGE				
Percent of state's unemployed with benefits	33.7	30.9	34.4	35.2
Percent in states with coverage <25%	10.3%	13.0%	5.2%	0.0%
Percent in states with 25-35% coverage	50.7%	51.8%	54.5%	61.0%
Percent in states with 35-45% coverage	37.9%	34.0%	40.4%	33.3%
Percent in states with 45% or higher coverage	1.1%	1.3%	0.0%	5.7%
NUMBER OF JOBS				
Single Job	70.5%	56.8%	26.2%	39.7%
Multiple Jobs	29.6%	43.2%	73.9%	60.3%
Two Jobs	24.4%	25.2%	32.6%	16.4%
Three Jobs	2.8%	11.1%	32.4%	29.2%
Four or more jobs	2.4%	6.9%	8.9%	14.7%

Source: IWPR calculations based on 1984, 1986, 1987 and 1988 Survey of Income and Program Participation.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 5
WORK/WELFARE PACKAGERS

Average Characteristics of Work/Welfare Packagers

Characteristic	No Unemployment Benefits	Receives Unemployment Benefits
POPULATION	1,069,508	129,447
As % of Work/Welfare Packagers	89.2%	10.8%
DEMOGRAPHICS		
Age of mother *	29.0	30.0
Months Single	23.5	22.7
Previously Married *	50.8%	41.7%
Got Married during survey	5.2%	9.3%
Got divorced, separated, widowed	4.6%	8.8%
Number of children	1.9	1.9
Age of youngest child *	4.6	5.4
Child under 2* or birth during survey	37.7%	28.3%
First-time Mother during survey	5.8%	3.9%
No Grandparent in the mother's home	73.6%	83.8%
Mother is head of family	68.8%	74.2%
Months mother is top-income household member	18.1	19.4
Number of other adults in household	0.8	0.6
Months of motherhood	23.2	23.5
Work-limiting disability	16.0%	17.0%
Work-preventing disability **	3.3%	0.0%
HUMAN CAPITAL		
High School Diploma **	66.7%	67.8%
No High School *	8.9%	11.4%
Some High School *	29.1%	26.0%
High School Graduate *	41.1%	43.7%
Some College *	19.4%	17.2%
College Graduate *	1.5%	1.7%
Student during survey	36.9%	32.8%
Job Training (ever or current)	32.9%	40.0%
Federal Job Training (ever or current)	14.2%	15.8%
WORK BEHAVIOR		
Work experience (years)	5.4	7.8
Total hours of labor	1788.5	2092.6
Total hours of W/S work	1698.0	2081.7
Total hours of S/E work	90.5	10.9
Weeks employed	53.6	57.3
Weeks looking for work/on layoff	14.2	29.8
RACE/ETHNICITY		
Anglo-American	42.1%	61.9%
African-American	44.9%	22.2%
Hispanic	10.6%	12.9%
Other Racial Background	2.5%	2.9%
Born in foreign country	4.5%	10.2%

* Variable based on response in first wave of survey.
** Variable based on response in third wave of survey.
*** AFDC history variables apply only to persons with repeat spells.

Source: IWPR calculations based on the 1984, 1986, 1987 and 1988 Survey of Income and Program Participation.

PRELIMINARY DATA

BEST COPY AVAILABLE